

REMARK

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated November 25, 2008 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 12 and 16 are hereby amended; claim 13 is hereby cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; and claims 1-11 are withdrawn from consideration. Accordingly, claims 12 and 16 are pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claim 12 is objected to because of the informalities. Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendment in claim 12, this objection is now believed to be moot.

In the Office Action, claims 12-13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0013920 to Hashimoto et al. (hereinafter "Hashimoto") in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 60-003609 to Hirokazu (hereinafter "Hirokazu") and Japanese Patent Publication No. 61-055625 to Yamamoto (hereinafter "Yamamoto").

The rejection of claims 12-13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto in view of Hirokazu and Yamamoto is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 12 is allowable in that it recites "the number of the syringes corresponds to the number of lines or column of the image display parts and all the syringes are operated in same time so that each syringe dispenses the sealant onto the corresponding a plurality of image display parts to form seal pattern." None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least these features of the claimed invention.

In rejecting claim 12, the Examiner acknowledges that Hashimoto "does not explicitly teach using a dispenser having a number of syringes corresponding to the number of lines of

columns of the image display parts and that all the syringes are operated at the same time.” See Office Action, lines 4-6 page 3.

The Examiner cites Yamamoto as allegedly teaching “the simultaneous deposition of liquid crystal into all of the display parts can shorten production time.” See Office Action, lines 7-9 page 3.

As motivation for modifying the deficiency of Hashimoto with Yamamoto, the Examiner states, “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to have supplied the dispenser of Hashimoto with multiple syringes to correspond with each of the display parts and to have simultaneously dispensed onto all of the display parts with a reasonable expectation of success.” See Office Action, lines 9-12 page 3.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s statement. In the claimed invention, since the number of the syringes corresponds to the number of lines or columns of the image display parts, one syringe dispenses the material onto a plurality of image display parts in the corresponding line or column. On the contrary, in Yamamoto the liquid crystal is simultaneously deposited into all of the display parts. Thus, in Yamamoto the syringe dispenses the material onto only one display part, not a plurality of display parts in the line or column of the corresponding syringe.

Further, in Yamamoto the number of the syringes corresponds to the number of the image display parts, since one syringe dispenses the material onto only one display part. On the contrary, in the claimed invention the number of the syringes corresponds to the number of lines or column of the image display parts, not the number of the image display parts.

Therefore, Yamamoto fails to teach or suggest at least “the number of the syringes corresponds to the number of lines or column of the image display parts and all the syringes are operated in same time so that each syringe dispenses the sealant onto the corresponding a plurality of image display parts to form seal pattern.”

Further, in the claimed invention the syringes dispense the sealant. On the contrary, in Hashimoto and Yamamoto the dispenser merely dispenses the liquid crystal material, not the sealant.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 and claim 16, which depends from claim 12, are allowable over the cited reference.

Since the rejected claim 13 is cancelled, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 25, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant